

Massachusetts Department of Early Education and Care  
Grant Application

**Appendix A**

**FY2015 EARLY EDUCATION AND OUT OF SCHOOL TIME CAPITAL FUND GRANT EVALUATION  
AND RATING CRITERIA**

While the final decisions on EEOST grant awards will be made by EEC, CEDAC, through its affiliate the Children's Investment Fund, will review all grant applications and make recommendations to EEC on those projects eligible for funding. CEDAC will score proposals according to the evaluation and rating criteria below. EEC reserves the right to determine the size of grant awards based on an applicant's score.

In determining whether to award a grant, EEC will consider:

- The applicant's proposal score, in conjunction with, the applicant's and development team's experience and qualifications,
- The applicant's plan and costs of the proposed capital project,
- The applicant's contracting/grant history with the Commonwealth,
- Whether the applicant is in good standing with EEC, and
- The best value to the Commonwealth.

EEC has included evaluation and rating criteria to guide applicants in completing the grant application. This rubric provides the general criteria for all grant questions. Please note the following:

1. In general, **applications received after the deadline will not be reviewed or considered for funding.** EEC reserves the right to review and/or fund an application submitted after the deadline where an emergency situation caused or contributed to the late submission.
2. EEC and CEDAC reserve the right to request: (1) additional information regarding any responses/applications received or (2) revisions to responses/applications. EEC and CEDAC shall have the right to specify the amount of time for submission of additional information/revisions. EEC and CEDAC shall have the right to disqualify responses where such information and/or revisions are not submitted within specified timeframe.
3. EEC and CEDAC reserve the right to interview respondents and visit proposed sites as part of the application and evaluation process.

In making recommendations to EEC, CEDAC will consider:

1. **Capital Project Readiness:** Projects are ready to proceed, will raise all necessary capital funds, finalize plans and specifications, secure all necessary approvals, and complete the project within 24 months of the date of the EEOST Capital Fund grant award.
2. **QRIS Progression and Maintenance:** The project will enable the Eligible Facility to progress to at least a level 3 in QRIS physical environment standards, or if already verified at level 4, to maintain the level 4 standards.

Massachusetts Department of Early Education and Care  
Grant Application

3. **Programs that offer full day, full year programs:** Licensed Large Group applicants must operate a full time, year round program, and School Age Programs must provide wrap-around care during the summer.

CEDAC will also use the Underwriting Standards, described in Section IV of the EEOST Program Guidelines. A summary of these standards is provided below.

1. **Project Feasibility**, including the terms of other financing commitments, the security and length of the income stream, and estimated project costs.
2. **Site Considerations**, including appropriateness for the program, environmental conditions, costs of acquisition, and arms-length transactions related to site acquisition or lease arrangements.
3. **Development Team Capacity**, including demonstrated ability to develop the Eligible Project in all respects.
4. **Owner's Project Manager**, with experience in managing similar projects.
5. **Development Costs**, including all hard and soft costs, with reasonable Developer fees:
  - a. Developer's fee of less than 5% of total development cost.
  - b. Sound business practices and fiduciary responsibility
  - c. Projects designed to meet the needs of children served by the Eligible Facility, licensing and QRIS Level 3 physical environment standards; facilities that can be readily maintained for the full use during the required minimum terms.
  - d. Operating budget that projects operating activities for 10 years.

CEDAC and EEC will also take into account the Award Preferences in Section II of the EEOST Capital Fund Program Guidelines in making recommendations and final grant awards.

Please use the following scoring rubric as a guide for awarding points for the applicants **Proposal Narrative**. Note: EEC reserves the right to develop evaluation and rating criteria that is specific to a particular grant. In such cases, EEC will provide reviewers with tailored rating criterion.

Massachusetts Department of Early Education and Care  
Grant Application

**Grant Review Score Sheet**

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Maximum Points Available</b>
1. Capital Project Readiness	20
2. QRIS Progression & Maintenance	15
3. Project Feasibility	15
4. Site Consideration	10
5. Development Team & Project Manager	20
6. Development Costs	10
7. Preferences	<u>10</u>
Total	100

**Rating Criteria**

**Maximum Point Value 10**

0 Points: The applicant's answer is incomplete and/or vague. The answer does not demonstrate an understanding of the grant requirements. The weaknesses of the answer far outweigh its strengths.

2 Points: The applicant's answer barely meets minimum requirements. It provides insufficient detail of the grant requirements. The weaknesses of the answer outweigh its strengths.

4 Points: The applicant's answer is not comprehensive. It satisfies some requirements. Answer offers few details and fails to develop the response beyond public knowledge of grant requirements.

6 Points: The applicant's answer is adequate and satisfies grant requirements. Overall, the answer demonstrates more strengths than weaknesses.

8 Points: The applicant's answer is comprehensive. It satisfies the grant requirements and, in some areas, exceeds the requirements. The answer's strengths far outweigh any weaknesses.

10 Points: The applicant's answer is comprehensive. It addresses all information and documentation identified in the submission requirements and, in the majority of instances, exceeds all requirements. No weaknesses are identified.

Massachusetts Department of Early Education and Care  
Grant Application

**Maximum Point Value 15**

0 Points: The applicant's answer is incomplete and/or vague. The answer does not demonstrate an understanding of the grant requirements. The weaknesses of the answer far outweigh its strengths.

3 Points: The applicant's answer barely meets minimum requirements. It provides insufficient detail of the grant requirements. The weaknesses of the answer outweigh its strengths.

6 Points: The applicant's answer is not comprehensive. It satisfies some requirements. Answer offers few details and fails to develop the response beyond public knowledge of grant requirements.

9 Points: The applicant's answer is adequate and satisfies grant requirements. Overall, the answer demonstrates more strengths than weaknesses.

12 Points: The applicant's answer is comprehensive. It satisfies the grant requirements and, in some areas, exceeds the requirements. The answer's strengths far outweigh any weaknesses.

15 Points: The applicant's answer is comprehensive. It addresses all information and documentation identified in the submission requirements and, in the majority of instances, exceeds all requirements. No weaknesses are identified.

**Maximum Point Value 20**

0 Points: The applicant's answer is incomplete and/or vague. The answer does not demonstrate an understanding of the grant requirements. The weaknesses of the answer far outweigh its strengths.

4 Points: The applicant's answer barely meets minimum requirements. It provides insufficient detail of the grant requirements. The weaknesses of the answer outweigh its strengths.

8 Points: The applicant's answer is not comprehensive. It satisfies some requirements. Answer offers few details and fails to develop the response beyond public knowledge of grant requirements.

12 Points: The applicant's answer is adequate and satisfies grant requirements. Overall, the answer demonstrates more strengths than weaknesses.

16 Points: The applicant's answer is comprehensive. It satisfies the grant requirements and, in some areas, exceeds the requirements. The answer's strengths far outweigh any weaknesses.

20 Points: The applicant's answer is comprehensive. It addresses all information and documentation identified in the submission requirements and, in the majority of instances, exceeds all requirements. No weaknesses are identified.